

Appl. No. 09/876,413  
Sevack et al.

### **REMARKS**

Responsive to the communication mailed on December 11, 2003, Applicants provide the following remarks in an effort to address the issues noted by the Examiner and to more particularly point out and distinctly claim their invention. Reconsideration and reexamination are, therefore, respectfully requested.

#### **Status of the Claims**

Claims 1 to 10 are still pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9 and 10 are currently amended and claims 3, 6 and 7 are not amended by the present amendment.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

In the Outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejects claims 1 to 3 and 8 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mandellos (US 5,861,633).

Claim 1 has been amended to better define the present invention. Currently amended claim 1 now states that the reflector/shield is an extruded one-piece element and that its outer surface deflects air away from the ultra-violet lamp.

This differs from Mandellos that has a multi-elements reflector.

Claim 1 in its amended form is therefore believed allowable since it includes elements that are not present or inferred in the cited prior art.

Claims 2, 3 and 8 all depend directly or indirectly on allowable Claim 1 and, at least for this reason, are believed allowable.

Appl. No. 09/876,413  
Sevack et al.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nicholson (US 4,250,390).

Claim 9 has been amended to better define the present invention. Currently amended claim 1 now states that the reflector/shield is an extruded one-piece element and that its outer surface deflects air away from the ultra-violet lamp.

This differs from Nicholson that has a multiple reflectors that are enclosed in a box (see Figure 4) therefore preventing air from being deflected from the outer surface of the reflector.

Claim 9 in its amended form is therefore believed allowable since it includes elements that are not present or inferred in the cited prior art.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103**

In the Outstanding Office action claims 4 to 7 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mandellos in view of Funomoto *et al.* (US 6,108,060).

It is respectfully submitted that claims 4 to 7 all depend directly or indirectly on allowable Claim 1 and, at least for this reason, are believed allowable.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nicholson in view of Mandellos.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 10 depends directly on allowable Claim 9 and, at least for this reason, is believed allowable.

Appl. No. 09/876,413  
Sevack et al.

It should be understood that claim amendments for which no explanation is established above were made for clarity purposes only and not for reasons related to statutory requirements for patentability.

No new subject matter has been added to the claims. The amendments to the claims are fully supported by the specifications as originally filed.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notification to this effect is earnestly solicited.


**FEE STATEMENT**

It is believed that no additional fees are due at the present time. However, in the event of any fee deficiency or overpayment, authorization is hereby granted to charge such deficiency or credit such overpayment to deposit account No. 12-2147.

Respectfully Submitted,  
LORUSSO LOUD & KELLY LLP

Dated: March 11, 2004

15 Rye Street 312  
Pease International Tradeport  
Portsmouth, NH 03801  
Phone: (603) 427-0070  
Fax: (603) 427-5530



Marc A. Vivenzio  
Reg. No. 52,326